IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Inventor	:	David Johnston Lynch
Application No.	:	09/475,448
Filed	:	December 30, 1999
Title	:	Ratings Control System with Temporary Override
		Capability and Conflict Resolutions
Examiner	:	Annan Q. Shang
Art Unit	:	2623

APPEAL BRIEF

May It Please The Honorable Board:

Appellants appeal the Final Rejection dated August 9, 2007 of claims 10-29 of the above-identified application. The fee of five hundred and ten dollars ($510.00) for filing this Brief and any associated extension fee is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 07-0832. Enclosed is a single copy of this Brief.

Please charge any additional fee or credit any overpayment to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Appellants do not request an oral hearing.

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of Application Serial No. 09/475,448 is the Assignee of record:

Thomson Licensing S.A.

46 quai Alphonse Le Gallo

F-92100 Boulogne Billancourt

France

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are currently, and have been, no related Appeals or Interferences regarding Application Serial No. 09/475,448.

III.   STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 10-29 are rejected and the rejection of claims 10-29 is appealed. Claims 1-9 have been cancelled in a previous response.

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All amendments were entered and are reflected in the claims included in Appendix I.

V.   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 10 provides a system including a video signal processor for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for display to at least one viewer (page 1, lines 4-6; page 4, line 14-page 5, line 2). A supervisor control system is provided which is operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile (page 6, lines 24-26; Figure 1, reference no. 14) identifying images to be blocked from display to at least one viewer (page 5, lines 25-31). The supervisor control system allows a supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to the viewer profile such that the select program is unblocked (page 7, lines 3-27; Figure 1, reference no. 23) for the duration of the program while the other of the plurality of images for display are blocked according to the viewer profile (page 5, lines 21-23; Figure 1, reference no. 24). Upon completion of the selected specific program, the supervisor control system identifies

images to be blocked according to the at least one viewer profile (page 5, lines 2-5; page 6, lines 3-9).

Dependent claim 11 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that images correspond to programs and the viewer profile identifies programs to be blocked from display to at least one viewer (page 4, line 14-page 5, line 2).

Dependent claim 12 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that the images correspond to channels and wherein the viewer profile identifies channels to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer (page 4, line 14-page 5, line 2).

Dependent claim 13 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that the viewer profile identifies at least one time period during which all images are to be blocked from display to the viewer (page 5, lines 18-21).

Dependent claim 14 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that an override list is formed including a selection of a plurality of programs having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to the viewer profile by a user and that override list is applicable to at least one corresponding viewer profile such that at least one image to be blocked according to the viewer profile is unblocked the at least one other image not blocked according to that viewer profile is blocked (page 5, lines 14-24).

Dependent claim 15 includes all the features of claims 10 and 14, along with the additional feature that the override list is temporarily applied to at least one viewer profile (page 6, lines 1-7).

Dependent claim 16 includes all the features of claims 10 and 14, along with the additional feature that the override list is applied for a period of time specified by the supervisor (page 5, lines 18-21).

Dependent claim 17 includes all the features of claims 10 and 14, along with the additional feature that the override list includes at least one override selected from the group including: a) at least one channel blocking override, b) at least one time period blocking override, c) at least one rating blocking override, d) at least one program blocking override, e) at least one spending limit override, f) at least one image content blocking override, g) at least one total view time limit override (page 5, lines 14-24; page 6, lines 22-30).

Dependent claim 18 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that at least one override list is applicable to a plurality of viewer profiles (page 5, lines 14-21).

Dependent claim 19 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that the control system is operable by the supervisor to create a plurality of override lists applicable to the at least one viewer profile (page 5, lines 14-21; page 8, lines 20-30).

Dependent claim 20 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that the control system is operable by the supervisor to create a plurality of override lists applicable to a plurality of viewer profiles (page 5, lines 14-21; page 8, lines 20-30).

Dependent claim 21 includes all the features of claim 10, along with the additional feature that the supervisor control system for producing an output signal includes at least one item selected from the group comprising: television receiver, set top box, video cassette recorder tuner (page 4, line 14-page 5, line 2).

Dependent claim 22 includes all the features of claims 10 and 14, along with the additional feature to display to a viewer a blocking status based upon the override list (page 5, lines 11-13).

Independent claim 23 provides, in a video signal processing system for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce images to be displayed to at least one viewer, a method for blocking viewing by at least one viewer (page 1, lines 4-6; page 4,

line 14-page 5, line 2). A viewer profile (page 6, lines 24-26; Figure 1, reference no. 14) identifying images to be blocked for a corresponding viewer is created (page 5, lines 25-31). A program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to the viewer profile is selected so as to allow the corresponding viewer to view the select program for the duration of the program (page 7, lines 3-27; Figure 1). Blocking of other of the images to be displayed according to the viewer profile is monitored (page 5, lines 21-23; Figure 1, reference no. 24). Blocking of viewing all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of the selected program is monitored (page 5, lines 2-5; page 6, lines 3-9).

Dependent claim 24 includes all the features of claim 23, along with the additional feature of forming an override list upon selection of a plurality of programs and storing the override list in a memory of the system (page 7, lines 15-16).

Dependent claim 25 includes all the features of claims 23 and 24, along with the additional feature of specifying a time period for application of the override list to the viewer profile (page 5, lines 18-21).

Dependent claim 26 includes all the features of claims 23 and 24, along with the additional feature of applying the override list to the viewer profile at the start of the specified time period and stopping application of the override list to the viewer profile after expiration of the specified time period (page 7, lines 21-26).

Dependent claim 27 includes all the features of claim 23, along with the additional feature that the images include programs and the viewer profile identifies programs to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer (page 4, line 14-page 5, line 2).

Dependent claim 28 includes all the features of claim 23, along with the additional feature that the images include channels and the viewer profile identifies channels to be blocked from display to the at least one viewer (page 5, lines 2-13).

Dependent claim 29 includes all the features of claim 23, along with the additional feature that the viewer profile identifies at least one time period during which all images are blocked from display to the viewer (page 5, lines 18-21).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886).

Claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of West et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,575), hereinafter "West."

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Sullivan et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0040034), hereinafter "Sullivan."

VII.   ARGUMENT

Abecassis does not anticipate claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29. Thus, reversal of the rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested. Additionally, Abecassis in view of Collings does not make claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 unpatentable. Thus, reversal of the rejection of claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested. Moreover, Abecassis in view of West does not make claim 20 unpatentable. Thus, reversal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) is respectfully requested. Additionally, Abecassis in view Collings, in further view of Sullivan does not make claim 18 unpatentable. Thus, reversal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested. Reversal of the Final Rejection (hereinafter termed "rejection") of claims 10-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested and reversal of the objection to the Drawings is respectfully requested.

Overview of the Cited References

Abecassis describes a method and a system for a user (e.g. a parent) to restrict a time (e.g. a time of day and/or an accumulated viewing during a specified time frame), and to restrict the videos and/or versions of videos that may be viewed by a viewer (e.g. a child) and/or a plurality of individually restricted viewers. The videos and/or versions of videos being restricted with respect to, for example, at least one content category (e.g. a rating code), a level in at least one content category, and/or a level of explicitness in each of a plurality of content categories. In an embodiment, random access and buffering means are utilized to retrieve segments of a video, to buffer at least a portion of a segment of a video, and to seamlessly skip a retrieval of at least one segment of the video, thereby playing, from within the video a seamless version of the video less in length than the length of the video (*see* Abstract).

Collings describes a method and apparatus block the reception of television programming which meets specified criteria. Data packets describing television programming are broadcast with the television signal. The data packets include at least packets which contain category information specifying a level in one or more multi-level categories and/or label information specifying labels applied to the program content of the signal. Data packets in an incoming video signal are detected by a blocking apparatus and compared to preferences stored in non-volatile memory in the blocking apparatus. If the contents of the data packets match or exceed the stored preferences then the video signal is blocked. The apparatus is field configurable. Configuration information specifying the rating scheme is transmitted to the apparatus. The methods of the invention are extremely flexible and allow several different rating systems to be used simultaneously (*see* Abstract).

West describes a viewer discretion television program control system, including devices and methods for controlling access to television viewing, especially by children. The system includes provision for storing suitability ratings for each program receivable by a television set, allocation of personal identification numbers to each of a plurality of potential viewers (e.g., children), and individual allocations of permissible viewing time and program content, all under the control of a local authority such as a parent or guardian (*see* Abstract).

Sullivan describes a system and method for controlling a plurality of parental control subsystems within an entertainment system is provided. The system includes a computer interfaced to a plurality of audio and/or audiovisual devices, wherein at least two of the audio and/or audiovisual devices within the system each comprise a native parental control subsystem or locking mechanism having adjustable parameters. A software locking mechanism operates the computer to allow a user to input one or more general parental control parameters and then sets the adjustable parameters of each native parental control subsystem within the system by mapping the parental control parameters onto each separate, native mechanisms for each device (*see* Abstract).

Rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886)

Reversal of the rejection of claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) is respectfully requested because the rejection makes crucial errors in interpreting the cited reference. The rejection erroneously states that claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29 are made anticipated by Abecassis.

CLAIMS 10, 11, 13 and 21

Independent claim 10 provides a system including a video signal processor for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for

display to at least one viewer. A supervisor control system is provided which is operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile identifying images to be blocked from display to at least one viewer. The supervisor control system allows a supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to the viewer profile such that the select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of the plurality of images for display are blocked according to the viewer profile. Upon completion of the selected specific program, the supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to the at least one viewer profile. Abecassis neither discloses nor suggests the above mentioned features of the present claimed invention.

Abecassis describes restricting a time (e.g., time of day and/or an accumulated viewing during a specified time frame), a video and/or versions of videos that may be viewed by a viewer such as a child or a restricted viewer. In Abecassis, a "RAViT" program gives "an editor (i.e. parent) complete control as to the video material to which a viewer/player (i.e. child) is exposed ... RAViT provides: user, time of day, amount of viewing controls; and individual preferences for each viewer/player or class of viewers/players" (col. 23, lines 19-24). "Specifically ... [the system] permits an editor to automatically **select segments** of a video program previously identified in a program segment map as providing material which may not be suitable for a viewer; **viewing the selected segments** and determining their suitability for viewing by the viewer" (col. 23, lines 30-35). An editor can block certain scenes in a program by using a chart or matrix. The matrix includes a number of categories, as shown in Figures 2A and 2B. Each category may be assigned a number. "Each number in the matrix 219 in the chart represents the particular descriptor for a given category that can be assigned to a specific scene or segment. For example, a scene of an old western style barroom brawl may be assigned a 130-4 (graphic violence). While the absence of an element is presumed, unless otherwise indicated, as an example, the absence of bloodshed is assigned a 135-1 (no bloodshed)" (col. 8, lines 29-36). In this way, a user is "provide[d] ... the option of editing-out the explicit bloodshed in a variable content program, the program segment map includes an additional segment definition 321 beginning at frame 4112 and ending at frame 5205" (col. 9, lines 34-38).

Additionally, Abecassis describes "automatically exclude[ing] segments of the variable

9

content program containing material which the viewer does not wish to view, and to transmit as a logical seamless transparently harmonious and continuous program only those sequential or non-sequential scenes or segments of the program whose content and form of expression are consistent with the viewer's preestablished video content preferences" (col. 6, lines 37-44). Therefore, Abecassis describes allowing an editor (i.e. parent) to select segments of a program which may have been identified as not being suitable for a viewer (i.e. child), and view the selected segment so that the editor can determine the suitability of the segment for viewing by the viewer. The viewer may exclude **segments** which the viewer does not wish to view. Abecassis does not disclose or suggest a "supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said **select program is unblocked** for the **duration of the program** while the **other of said plurality of images for display are blocked** according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. The cited passages of Abecassis, cited by the Office Action, do not disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. The first cited passage describes

> "[a] video provider system 700 ... i) mass storage random access memory devices 701 for storing a plurality of variable content programs, and a plurality of program segment maps each defining segments of a corresponding video program; ii) communications linkages ... iii) processing hardware/software 703 for retrieving from participating subscriber video system a subscriber's video content preferences ... iv) random access devices 704 for retrieving for each participating subscriber the corresponding selected variable content programs and/or video segments; and v) transmission architecture 705 for transmitting ... the corresponding retrieved selections. Simply stated, an on-line variable content program provider provides each viewer content-on-demand" (col. 19, line 54-col. 20, line 9).

Thus, a viewer is provided content-on-demand. The first cited passage also describes:

> "In a preferred embodiment, in response to a subscriber 721 request of one or more variable content program(s) from a video provider 700 ... is provided via the fiber optic network 711. Alternatively, the program is provided to the subscriber in the form that results from the execution of the viewer's video content preferences, i.e. a logical seamless sequence of only those segments that are consistent with the viewer preferences are transmitted in a real-time or a non real-time format over the network 711 ... the subscriber 721 remains on-line with the video provider 700 during the transmission of the video and utilizes the hardware resources of the video provider, a RAViT comprising

principally communications capabilities without significant local storage, processing, or memory, is adequate. In such an architecture the viewer preferences are retained by the video provider" (col. 20, lines 10-27).

Thus, the first cited passage allows results to be executed from the viewer's video content preferences. Only those segments that are consistent with the viewer preferences are transmitted over the network. The viewer's preferences are retrained by the video provider. This is completely unrelated to the "select[ed] program [that] is **unblocked** for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. The second cited passage of Abecassis mainly describes the RAViT system.

"RAViT automatically initiates playing of the video program without the necessity of any further viewer interaction or instructions ... once RAViT initially learns the viewer's preferences, it does not require any more of the viewer than, for example, a conventional laser disc player ... It is intended that a single viewer preferences serve both gaming and viewing applications ... the viewer selects and retrieves the desired program consistent with the architecture of the particular RAViT hardware implementation. Upon selection of the play function 802, RAViT's software, firmware, and hardware processing capabilities ... issue a command to read the viewer control setup to ascertain if viewer control is enabled 803. If enabled, RAViT's handshaking routines request viewer identification ... If viewer identification and password are found acceptable 805, the processor checks for other restrictions to a user access 807 ... The user-permission capability enables a parent to have complete control over the use of RAViT, and provides for multiple individualized preferences ... Once viewer preferences are established, the processor verifies set up status for editing privileges 814, to determine if the viewer has editing privileges ... The processor at this point transmits to the television a request for the viewer to indicate if the existing preferences are to be edited 815. If at step 814 edit privileges are not available for the viewer, the processor initiates normal play routines ... Editing the viewer preferences 818 is supervised to insure that viewer modifications are consistent with the permissions established for that viewer" (col. 21, line 39-col. 22, line 56).

Thus, Abecassis describes that the RAViT learns a viewer's preferences for both gaming and viewing applications. Upon pressing play, RAViT checks to see if viewer control is enabled. If enabled, the user is asked to enter a password, etc. to see if the viewer should be given permission to access the program. Viewer preferences may be edited if the viewer is allowed to access this feature. However, merely allowing a user to access a program upon checking if the user is authorized to do so, as in Abecassis, does not disclose or suggest "select[ing] a specific

program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention.

Furthermore, the third cited passage of Abecassis describes the capabilities of the RAViT system, where

> "an editor (i.e. parent) complete[ly] control[s] as to the video material to which a viewer/player (i.e. child) is exposed ... RAViT provides: user, time of day, amount of viewing controls; and individual preferences for each viewer/player or class of viewers/players ... an editor [is permitted] to automatically select segments of a video program previously identified in a program segment map as providing material which may not be suitable for a viewer; viewing the selected segments and determining their suitability for viewing by the viewer" (col. 23, lines 19-35).

Additionally, "a viewer/player is associated with a descriptor code paralleling the MPAA rating system ... a viewer/player is associated with an appropriate rating code, thereafter, the viewing/playing of a program is consistent with the rating code associated with the respective viewer ... for example, by means of a single code associated with each viewer, a parent to view an 'R' version of a film, and permits a child to view a 'G' version of the same film" (col. 24, lines 58-65). However, nowhere in the cited passages or elsewhere in Abecassis is there any mention or suggestion of a "supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. Abecassis may describe allowing an editor, such as a parent, to view segments of programs for the purpose of determining whether the segment suitable for a viewer, such as a child, or not. Moreover, Abecassis may allow a parent to view an "R" version of a film and permit a child to view a "G" rated version of the same film. Abecassis may allow **blocking of segments** of programs not suitable for children, however, Abecassis is not concerned with "select[ing] a **specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs" and **UNBLOCKING the selected program** "for the duration of the

program while other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. Blocking of <u>segments</u> and allowing a viewer to view a segment of a program to determine suitability, as in Abecassis, is not equivalent to unblocking an <u>entire program</u> that would have been blocked, according to a viewer profile, as in the present claimed invention. Additionally, Abecassis may <u>allow a user</u> to determine the suitability of a particular segment of a program, however, Abecassis does not disclose or suggest that a program would have been blocked and is now UNBLOCKED. Rather, Abecassis only merely describes allowing a viewer to view a segment of a program, which is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which unblocks a selected program "for the duration of the program while other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. Moreover, in Abecassis, <u>a user</u> determines suitability of a particular segment of a program, but Abecassis neither discloses nor suggests "whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said **supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked** according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention.

Therefore, as Abecassis fails to show or suggest each feature in claim 10, Abecassis does not anticipate the present claimed invention. Additionally, as claims 11, 13 and 21 are dependent on independent claim 10, these claims are also not anticipated by Abecassis. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10, 11, 13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

<u>CLAIMS 23-25, 29 and 29</u>

Independent claim 23 provides, in a video signal processing system for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce images to be displayed to at least one viewer, a method for blocking viewing by at least one viewer. A viewer profile identifying images to be blocked for a corresponding viewer is created. A program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to the viewer profile is selected so as to allow the corresponding viewer to view the select program for the duration of the program. Blocking of other of the images to be displayed according to the viewer profile is monitored. Blocking of viewing all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of the selected program is monitored. Abecassis neither discloses nor suggests the above mentioned features of

the present claimed invention.

Abecassis describes restricting a time (e.g., time of day and/or an accumulated viewing during a specified time frame), a video and/or versions of videos that may be viewed by a viewer such as a child or a restricted viewer. In Abecassis, a "RAViT" program gives "an editor (i.e. parent) complete control as to the video material to which a viewer/player (i.e. child) is exposed ... RAViT provides: user, time of day, amount of viewing controls; and individual preferences for each viewer/player or class of viewers/players" (col. 23, lines 19-24). "Specifically ... [the system] permits an editor to automatically **select segments** of a video program previously identified in a program segment map as providing material which may not be suitable for a viewer; **viewing the selected segments** and determining their suitability for viewing by the viewer" (col. 23, lines 30-35). An editor can block certain scenes in a program by using a chart or matrix. The matrix includes a number of categories, as shown in Figures 2A and 2B. Each category may be assigned a number. "Each number in the matrix 219 in the chart represents the particular descriptor for a given category that can be assigned to a specific scene or segment. For example, a scene of an old western style barroom brawl may be assigned a 130-4 (graphic violence). While the absence of an element is presumed, unless otherwise indicated, as an example, the absence of bloodshed is assigned a 135-1 (no bloodshed)" (col. 8, lines 29-36). In this way, a user is "provide[d] ... the option of editing-out the explicit bloodshed in a variable content program, the program segment map includes an additional segment definition 321 beginning at frame 4112 and ending at frame 5205" (col. 9, lines 34-38).

Additionally, Abecassis describes "automatically exclude[ing] segments of the variable content program containing material which the viewer does not wish to view, and to transmit as a logical seamless transparently harmonious and continuous program only those sequential or non-sequential scenes or segments of the program whose content and form of expression are consistent with the viewer's preestablished video content preferences" (col. 6, lines 37-44). Therefore, Abecassis describes allowing an editor (i.e. parent) to select segments of a program which may have been identified as not being suitable for a viewer (i.e. child), and view the selected segment so that the editor can determine the suitability of the segment for viewing by the viewer. The viewer may exclude **segments** which the viewer does not wish to view.

Abecassis does not disclose or suggest "selecting a program having a **rating above** a set rating for **blocking programs** to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the **duration of said program**" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Additionally, Abecassis neither discloses nor suggests "monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon **completion of said selected program**" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. The cited passages of Abecassis, cited by the Office Action, do not disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. The first cited passage describes

> "[a] video provider system 700 ... i) mass storage random access memory devices 701 for storing a plurality of variable content programs, and a plurality of program segment maps each defining segments of a corresponding video program; ii) communications linkages ... iii) processing hardware/software 703 for retrieving from participating subscriber video system a subscriber's video content preferences ... iv) random access devices 704 for retrieving for each participating subscriber the corresponding selected variable content programs and/or video segments; and v) transmission architecture 705 for transmitting ... the corresponding retrieved selections. Simply stated, an on-line variable content program provider provides each viewer content-on-demand" (col. 19, line 54-col. 20, line 9).

Thus, a viewer is provided content-on-demand. The first cited passage also describes:

> "In a preferred embodiment, in response to a subscriber 721 request of one or more variable content program(s) from a video provider 700 ... is provided via the fiber optic network 711. Alternatively, the program is provided to the subscriber in the form that results from the execution of the viewer's video content preferences, i.e. a logical seamless sequence of only those segments that are consistent with the viewer preferences are transmitted in a real-time or a non real-time format over the network 711 ... the subscriber 721 remains on-line with the video provider 700 during the transmission of the video and utilizes the hardware resources of the video provider, a RAViT comprising principally communications capabilities without significant local storage, processing, or memory, is adequate. In such an architecture the viewer preferences are retained by the video provider" (col. 20, lines 10-27).

Thus, the first cited passage allows results to be executed from the viewer's video content preferences. Only those segments that are consistent with the viewer preferences are transmitted over the network. The viewer's preferences are retrained by the video provider. This is completely unrelated to a selected "program having a **rating above a set rating for blocking**

programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. The second cited passage of Abecassis mainly describes the RAViT system.

> "RAViT automatically initiates playing of the video program without the necessity of any further viewer interaction or instructions ... once RAViT initially learns the viewer's preferences, it does not require any more of the viewer than, for example, a conventional laser disc player ... It is intended that a single viewer preferences serve both gaming and viewing applications ... the viewer selects and retrieves the desired program consistent with the architecture of the particular RAViT hardware implementation. Upon selection of the play function 802, RAViT's software, firmware, and hardware processing capabilities ... issue a command to read the viewer control setup to ascertain if viewer control is enabled 803. If enabled, RAViT's handshaking routines request viewer identification ... If viewer identification and password are found acceptable 805, the processor checks for other restrictions to a user access 807 ... The user-permission capability enables a parent to have complete control over the use of RAViT, and provides for multiple individualized preferences ... Once viewer preferences are established, the processor verifies set up status for editing privileges 814, to determine if the viewer has editing privileges ... The processor at this point transmits to the television a request for the viewer to indicate if the existing preferences are to be edited 815. If at step 814 edit privileges are not available for the viewer, the processor initiates normal play routines ... Editing the viewer preferences 818 is supervised to insure that viewer modifications are consistent with the permissions established for that viewer" (col. 21, line 39-col. 22, line 56).

Thus, Abecassis describes that the RAViT learns a viewer's preferences for both gaming and viewing applications. Upon pressing play, RAViT checks to see if viewer control is enabled. If enabled, the user is asked to enter a password, etc. to see if the viewer should be given permission to access the program. Viewer preferences may be edited if the viewer is allowed to access this feature. However, merely allowing a user to access a program upon checking if the user is authorized to do so, as in Abecassis, does not disclose or suggest "selecting a program having a **rating above a set rating for blocking programs** to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to **view said select program for the duration of said program**" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention.

Furthermore, the third cited passage of Abecassis describes the capabilities of the RAViT system, where

"an editor (i.e. parent) complete[ly] control[s] as to the video material to which a viewer/player (i.e. child) is exposed ... RAViT provides: user, time of day, amount of viewing controls; and individual preferences for each viewer/player or class of viewers/players ... an editor [is permitted] to automatically select segments of a video program previously identified in a program segment map as providing material which may not be suitable for a viewer; viewing the selected segments and determining their suitability for viewing by the viewer" (col. 23, lines 19-35).

Additionally, "a viewer/player is associated with a descriptor code paralleling the MPAA rating system ... a viewer/player is associated with an appropriate rating code, thereafter, the viewing/playing of a program is consistent with the rating code associated with the respective viewer ... for example, by means of a single code associated with each viewer, a parent to view an 'R' version of a film, and permits a child to view a 'G' version of the same film" (col. 24, lines 58-65). However, nowhere in the cited passages or elsewhere in Abecassis is there any mention or suggestion of "selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Abecassis may describe allowing an editor, such as a parent, to view segments of programs for the purpose of determining whether the segment is suitable for a viewer, such as a child, or not. Moreover, Abecassis may allow a parent to view an "R" version of a film and permit a child to view a "G" rated version of the same film. Abecassis may allow **blocking of segments** of programs not suitable for children, however, Abecassis is not concerned with "selecting a **program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs" and "allow[ing] said corresponding viewer to **view said select program** for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Blocking of segments and allowing a viewer to view a segment of a program to determine suitability, as in Abecassis, is not equivalent to viewing an entire selected program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs, as in the present claimed invention. Rather, Abecassis only merely describes allowing a viewer to view a segment of a program, which is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which allows viewing of a selected program that has a rating above a set rating for blocking a program "for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Moreover, as Abecassis does not allowing viewing of an entire program that would have been set as blocked, Abecassis cannot monitor "blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile

upon **completion of said selected program**" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention.

Therefore, as Abecassis fails to show or suggest each feature in claim 23, Abecassis does not anticipate the present claimed invention. Additionally, as claims 24, 25, 27 and 29 are dependent on independent claim 23, these claims are also not anticipated by Abecassis. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 24, 25, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Abecassis does not anticipate the present claimed invention as claimed in claims 10, 11, 13, 21, 23-25, 27 and 29. Therefore, Applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402)

Reversal of the rejection of claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402) is respectfully requested because the rejection makes crucial errors in interpreting the cited references. The rejection erroneously states that claims 12, 14-17, 19, 24-26 and 28 are made unpatentable by Abecassis in view of Collings.

CLAIMS 12, 14-17 and 19

Abecassis, when taken alone with Collings, neither discloses nor suggests "said supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. As described above with respect to claim 10, Abecassis merely describes allowing a user to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a viewer such as a child.

However, Abecassis (with Collings) neither discloses nor suggests the features of the present claimed invention.

Collings is directed to selectively blocking audio and video signals based upon a comparison of the contents of data packets transmitted with a television signal to stored preferences. The user is provided a menu which allows for the enabling, disabling and temporarily disabling one of a plurality of available blocking features. When a user wishes to view a program currently restricted by one of the multiple stored blocking preferences the user must enter the main menu and temporarily disable all the features containing limits applying to the selected program (*see* col. 17, lines 1-32). The length of the period in which the set limits are temporarily disabled is chosen by the user and input in the main menu (*see* Fig. 5B).

The Office Action asserts that Collings describes the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Collings does not teach selecting a program such that the selected program is unblocked. The system of Collings requires that in order to watch a restricted program, one must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. Essentially, Collings does not disclose the selection of a program to be unblocked (unblocked meaning to be fully unrestricted to the user). Rather Collings describes the selection of blocking preferences to be disabled. This is unlike the present invention which selects a program to be unblocked and displayed to the user. Collings merely allows for the supervisor to disable existing restrictions. Therefore, Collings, similar to Abecassis, neither discloses nor suggests selecting "**a specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is **unblocked for the duration of the program** while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention.

Additionally, Collings describes that in order to watch a program which exceeds the set ratings, one must enter the menu and either disable or temporarily disable the applicable blocking features. If the features were **disabled** in Collings, the at least one user profile will have been **altered** and upon completion of the program desired programs will be blocked in accordance with the **new altered** at least one user profile. If the features were **temporarily**

disabled, then the system would block programs according the original at least one user profile **only after** the pre-entered disable time length. This is unlike the present claimed invention which blocks programs **upon completion** of the selected program according to the **original** at least one user profile. Therefore, Collings, (with Abecassis), neither discloses nor suggests "whereby upon **completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of present invention.

The Office Action asserts further that the combination of the systems of Abecassis and Collings disclose the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as neither Abecassis and Collings are concerned with unblocking a single selected program having a rating above the set rating scheme while still blocking all other images according to the set blocking scheme, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is not concerned with unblocking the selected program while blocking all the other unselected programs according to the set blocking scheme. The combined system of Abecassis and Collings may describe a system which allows a user, such as a parent, to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a child. In the combined system, if a user wants to watch a restricted program, the user must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. However, the combined system of Abecassis and Collings neither discloses nor suggests selecting "**a specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is **unblocked for the duration of the program**" while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. Additionally, the combined system is not concerned with blocking all the images according to the set blocking scheme upon completion of the selected program, as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, the combination neither discloses nor suggests "whereby upon **completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted Abecassis and Collings, when taken alone or in combination, do not make the present claimed

invention as claimed in claim 10 unpatentable. As claims 12, 14-17 and 19 are dependent on independent claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable over Abecassis and Collings, when taken alone or in combination, for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claim 10. Consequently, it is further respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 12, 14-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 24-26 and 28

Abecassis, when taken alone with Collings, neither discloses nor suggests "selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program ... and monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. As described above with respect to claim 23, Abecassis merely describes allowing a user to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a viewer such as a child. However, Abecassis (with Collings) neither discloses nor suggests the features of the present claimed invention.

Collings is directed to selectively blocking audio and video signals based upon a comparison of the contents of data packets transmitted with a television signal to stored preferences. The user is provided a menu which allows for the enabling, disabling and temporarily disabling one of a plurality of available blocking features. When a user wishes to view a program currently restricted by one of the multiple stored blocking preferences the user must enter the main menu and temporarily disable all the features containing limits applying to the selected program (*see* col. 17, lines 1-32). The length of the period in which the set limits are temporarily disabled is chosen by the user and input in the main menu (*see* Fig. 5B).

The Office Action asserts that Collings describes the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, Collings does not teach "selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. The system of Collings requires

that in order to watch a restricted program, one must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. Essentially, Collings does not disclose the selection of a program to be viewed for the duration of the program and "monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Rather Collings describes the selection of blocking preferences to be disabled. This is unlike the present invention which selects a program to be viewed for the duration of the program and monitors blocking of viewing of all images upon completion of the program. Collings merely allows for the supervisor to disable existing restrictions. Therefore, Collings, similar to Abecassis, neither discloses nor suggests selecting "selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program ... monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention.

Additionally, Collings describes that in order to watch a program which exceeds the set ratings, one must enter the menu and either disable or temporarily disable the applicable blocking features. If the features were **disabled** in Collings, the at least one user profile will have been **altered** and upon completion of the program desired programs will be blocked in accordance with the **new altered** at least one user profile. If the features were **temporarily disabled**, then the system would block programs according the original at least one user profile **only after** the pre-entered disable time length. This is unlike the present claimed invention which blocks viewing of all images according to the viewer profile **upon completion** of the selected program. Therefore, Collings, (with Abecassis), neither discloses nor suggests "monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program" as recited in claim 23 of present invention.

The Office Action asserts further that the combination of the systems of Abecassis and Collings disclose the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as neither Abecassis and Collings are concerned with allowing viewing of a single selected program having a rating above the set rating for blocking programs while monitoring blocking of the other images to be displayed according to the viewer profile, it is

respectfully submitted that the combination is also not concerned with these features of the present claimed invention. The combined system of Abecassis and Collings may describe a system which allows a user, such as a parent, to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a child. In the combined system, if a user wants to watch a restricted program, the user must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. However, the combined system of Abecassis and Collings neither discloses nor suggests "selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Additionally, the combined system is not concerned with "monitoring blocking of the other of said images to be displayed according to the viewer profile" and "monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile **upon completion of said selected program**" as recited in claim 23 of the present invention. Therefore, the combination neither discloses nor suggests the features recited in the present claimed invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted Abecassis and Collings, when taken alone or in combination, do not make the present claimed invention unpatentable. As claims 24-26 and 28 are dependent on independent claim 23, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable over Abecassis and Collings, when taken alone or in combination, for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claim 23. Consequently, it is further respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 24-26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Abecassis, when taken alone or in combination with Collings does not make the present claimed invention as claimed in claim 23 unpatentable. As claims 24-26 and 28 are dependent on claim 23, these claims are also allowable over Abecassis in view of Collings. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of West (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,575)

Reversal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886), as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of West (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,575) is respectfully requested because the rejection makes crucial errors in interpreting the cited references. The rejection erroneously states that claim 20 is made unpatentable by Abecassis in view of West.

CLAIM 20

Abecassis, when taken alone with West, neither discloses nor suggests "said supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. As described above with respect to claim 10, Abecassis merely describes allowing a user to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a viewer such as a child. However, Abecassis (with West) neither discloses nor suggests the features of the present claimed invention.

West describe a viewer discretion television program control system including devices and methods for controlling access to television viewing. Multiple user allocation of permissible viewing times and program content are under the control of a system supervisor. However, West is not directed towards selecting a program to be viewed over an at least one viewer profile without changing the at least one viewer profile as in the present claimed invention. In fact, West, similarly to Abecassis, neither discloses nor suggests selecting a "specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

Additionally, West is not concerned with returning to the normal function of the at least one user profile upon completion of the selected program. Therefore, similarly to Abecassis,

neither disclose nor suggest "whereby upon completion of said select program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

The Office Action asserts that the combination of the systems of Abecassis and West discloses the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as the individual systems of Abecassis and West are not concerned with unblocking a single selected program while blocking all other images according to the set ratings scheme, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is not concerned with unblocking a selected program while blocking all other images according to the set blocking scheme. The combined system of Abecassis and West may allow a user, such as a parent, to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a child. The user may be a system supervisor and may allow multiple user allocation of permissible viewing times and program content. However, the combination, similar to the individual systems of Abecassis and West, neither discloses nor suggests selecting "**a specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is **unblocked for the duration of the program**" while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as claimed in claim 10 of the present invention. Additionally, as the individual systems of Abecassis and West are not concerned with blocking all the images according to the set blocking scheme upon completion of the selected program, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is not concerned with blocking all images based on the rating scheme after the completion of the selected program. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination, similar to the individual systems of Abecassis and West, neither discloses nor suggests "whereby upon **completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of present invention.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Abecassis, when taken alone or in combination with West, does not make the present claimed invention as claimed in claim 10 unpatentable. As claim 20 is dependent upon independent claim 10, claim 20 is also

allowable over Abecassis in view of West. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828402), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Sullivan (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0040034)

Reversal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,886) in view of Collings (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,402), as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Sullivan (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0040034) is respectfully requested because the rejection makes crucial errors in interpreting the cited references. The rejection erroneously states that claim 18 is made unpatentable by Abecassis in view of Collings, in further view of Sullivan.

<div align="center">CLAIM 18</div>

Abecassis, when taken alone with Collings and Sullivan, neither discloses nor suggests "said supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. As described above with respect to claim 10, Abecassis with Collings merely describes allowing a user to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a viewer such as a child. If a user wants to watch a restricted program, the user must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. However, Abecassis and Collings (with Sullivan) neither disclose nor suggest the features of the present claimed invention.

Sullivan describes a system and method for controlling a plurality of parental control subsystems within an entertainment system. The system includes a computer interfaced to a plurality of audio and/or audiovisual devices, wherein at least two of the audio and/or

audiovisual devices within the system each comprise a native parental control subsystem or locking mechanism having adjustable parameters. A software locking mechanism operates the computer to allow a user to input one or more general parental control parameters and then sets the adjustable parameters of each native parental control subsystem within the system by mapping the parental control parameters onto each separate, native mechanism for each device (*see* Abstract).

Sullivan describes a system and method for controlling a plurality of parental control subsystems within an entertainment system. Multiple user profiles may be created and saved in memory. However, Sullivan, similar to Abecassis and Collings, is not concerned with unblocking a single selected program while blocking all other images Abecassis and Collings, neither discloses nor suggests selecting "a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said **select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while all other images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile**" as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

Additionally, Sullivan is not concerned with returning to the normal function of the at least one user profile upon completion of the selected program. Therefore, Sullivan, similarly to Abecassis and Collings, neither discloses nor suggests "whereby **upon completion of said selected specific program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as claimed in independent claim 10 of present invention.

Furthermore, Sullivan is silent on providing an override list to override the viewability of the programs that are blocked or unblocked according to the viewer profile. While Sullivan describes a method for controlling different user profiles within an entertainment system, Sullivan is not concerned with providing the capability to override a ratings control system as in the present claimed invention. Specifically, Sullivan, similarly to Abecassis and Collings, neither discloses nor suggests providing "said override list is applicable to at least one corresponding viewer profile such that at least one image to be blocked according said viewer

profile is unblocked and at least one other image not blocked according to said viewer profile is blocked" as recited in claim 14 of present invention on which claim 18 depends.

The Office Action asserts that the combination of the systems of Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan discloses the principles of the present claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as the individual systems of Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan are not concerned with unblocking a single selected program while blocking all other images according to the set ratings scheme, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is not concerned with unblocking a selected program while blocking all other images according to the set blocking scheme. The combined system of Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan may describe a system which allows a user, such as a parent, to view a segment of a program to determine if the segment is suitable for a child. In the combined system, if a user wants to watch a restricted program, the user must disable all applicable blocking functions to the specified program. Multiple user profiles may be created and saved in memory. However, the combination, similar to the individual systems of Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan, neither discloses nor suggests selecting "**a specific program** having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is **unblocked for the duration of the program** while the other of the plurality of images produced for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as claimed in claim 10 of the present invention. Additionally, Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination, are not concerned with blocking all the images according to the set blocking scheme upon completion of the selected program. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the combination is not concerned with blocking all images based on the rating scheme after the completion of the selected program. Thus, the combination, similar to the individual systems of Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan, neither discloses nor suggests "whereby upon **completion of said select program**, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as claimed in claim 10 of present invention.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination, do not make the present claimed invention as claimed in claim 10 unpatentable. As claim 18 is dependent on

independent claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that claim 18 is also allowable over Abecassis, Collings and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination, for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to independent claim 10. Consequently, it is further respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

VIII   CONCLUSION

Abecassis, Collings, West and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest a "supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present claimed invention. Additionally, Abecassis, Collings, West and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination, do not disclose or suggest "whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile" as recited in claim 10 of the present invention. As claims 10 and 23 include similar subject matter, these claims are all allowable over Abecassis, Collings, West and Sullivan, when taken alone or in any combination. As claims 11-22 and 24-29 are dependent on claims 10 and 23, respectively, these claims are also allowable over Abecassis, Collings, West and Sullivan. Accordingly it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 10-29 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

David Johnston Lynch

By: Jack Schwartz
Reg. No. 34,721
Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
February 11, 2008

APPENDIX I - APPEALED CLAIMS

Claims 1-9 (Cancelled)

10. (Previously presented) A system comprising:

a video signal processor for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce a plurality of images for display to at least one viewer;

a supervisor control system operable by a supervisor to create at least one viewer profile identifying images to be blocked from display to said at least one viewer;

said supervisor control system operable by said supervisor to select a specific program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile such that said select program is unblocked for the duration of the program while the other of said plurality of images for display are blocked according to said viewer profile, whereby upon completion of said selected specific program, said supervisor control system identifies images to be blocked according to said at least one viewer profile.

11. (Previously presented) The system according to claim 10 wherein said images correspond to programs and said viewer profile identifies programs to be blocked from display to said at least one viewer.

12. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein said images correspond to channels and wherein said viewer profile identifies channels to be blocked from display to said at least one viewer.

13. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein said viewer profile identifies at least one time period during which all images are to be blocked from display to said viewer.

14. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein an override list is formed including a selection of a plurality of programs having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs applicable to said viewer profile by a user and said override list is applicable to at least one corresponding viewer profile such that at least one image to be blocked according to said viewer profile is unblocked and at least one other image not blocked according to said viewer profile is blocked.

15. (Previously presented) The system of claim 14 wherein said override list is temporarily applied to at least one viewer profile.

16. (Previously presented) The system of claim 14 wherein said override list is applied for a period of time specified by said supervisor.

17. (Previously presented) The system of claim 14 wherein said override list includes at least one override selected from the group comprising: a) at least one channel blocking override, b) at least one time period blocking override, c) at least one rating blocking override, d) at least one program blocking override, e) at least one spending limit override, f) at least one image content blocking override, g) at least one total view time limit override.

18. (Previously presented) The system of claim 14 wherein said at least one override list is applicable to a plurality of viewer profiles.

19. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein said control system is operable by said supervisor to create a plurality of override lists applicable to said at least one viewer profile.

20. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein said control system is operable by said supervisor to create a plurality of override lists applicable to a plurality of viewer profiles.

21. (Previously presented) The system of claim 10 wherein said supervisor control system for producing an output signal includes at least one item selected from the group comprising: television receiver, set top box, video cassette recorder tuner.

22. (Previously presented) The system of claim 14 further including means to display to a viewer a blocking status based upon said override list.

23. (Previously presented) In a video signal processing system for producing an output signal suitable for coupling to a display device to produce images to be displayed to at least one viewer, a method for blocking viewing by at least one viewer comprising the steps of;

creating a viewer profile identifying images to be blocked for a corresponding viewer;

selecting a program having a rating above a set rating for blocking programs to be applied to said viewer profile so as to allow said corresponding viewer to view said select program for the duration of said program;

monitoring blocking of the other of said images to be displayed according to the viewer profile; and

monitoring blocking of viewing of all images according to the viewer profile upon completion of said selected program.

24. (Previously presented) The method of claim 23 including the steps of forming an override list upon selection of a plurality of programs and storing said override list in a memory of said system.

25. (Previously presented) The method of claim 24 including a step of specifying a time period for application of said override list to said viewer profile.

26. (Previously presented) The method of claim 24 including a step of applying said override list to said viewer profile at the start of said specified time period and stopping application of said override list to said viewer profile after expiration of said specified time period.

27. (Previously presented) The method according to claim 23 wherein said images comprise programs and said viewer profile identifies programs to be blocked from display to said at least one viewer.

28. (Previously presented) The method of claim 23 wherein said images comprise channels and wherein said viewer profile identifies channels to be blocked from display to said at least one viewer.

29. (Previously presented) The method of claim 23 wherein said viewer profile identifies at least one time period during which all images are to be blocked from display to said viewer.

APPENDIX II   -   EVIDENCE

Applicant does not rely on any additional evidence other than the arguments submitted hereinabove.

APPENDIX III - RELATED PROCEEDINGS

      Applicant respectfully submits that there are no proceedings related to this appeal in which any decisions were rendered.

APPENDIX IV - TABLE OF CASES

APPENDIX V - LIST OF REFERENCES

U.S. Pat./Pub. No.	Issued Date	102(e) Date	Inventors
6,091,886	July 18, 2000		Abecassis
5,828,402	October 27, 1998		Collings
5,550,575	August 27, 1996		West et al.
2004/0040034	February 26, 2004		Sullivan et al.

TABLE OF CONTENTS